



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,076	01/28/2004	Hsu-Ping Tseng	025789-00006	9811

7590 03/25/2009
ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
Suite 400
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-5339

EXAMINER

CHEN, LUCY P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2871

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/25/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/765,076

Applicant(s)

TSENG ET AL.

Examiner

LUCY P. CHIEN

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,6,7 and 14-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17 and 26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,6,7,14-16,18-25 and 27-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/19/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1,3,6,7,14-16,18-25,27-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1,3,6,7,14-16,18,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuda et al (US 5361163).

Regarding Claim 1,3,6,7,15,16,

Matsuda et al discloses a liquid crystal projector (Fig. 22 to Fig. 30) a substrate (511); a least one protrusion (412,512) disposed on a surface of the substrate (511);

Art Unit: 2871

and a light reflective layer (Column 41, rows 49-53) also element (421) in Fig. 22)) deposited on a surface (if you flipped the whole display shown in Fig. 22 around then the reflective layer is on a surface of the protrusion) to the protrusion (512), wherein the protrusion (arcuate) amplifies light reflection intensity when light is reflected off the light reflective layer (421 and column 41, rows 39-41 where ((552,553,554,555) are base material of light diffusing and reflecting type, therefore is considered a reflective layer). A light shielding layer (404, column 29, rows 9,10) on a surface of the light reflective layer (421) opposite the at least one protrusion (412). wherein the light reflective layer comprises programmable code information ((531) register mark, column 36 rows 60-65). The register mark (which is a position sensing code) which is the programmable code information is simultaneously printed with the light absorbing stripes (530).The register mark (531) is made with (511). Fig. 22 is shows a lamination step in the production process of the reflection type projection screen with a reflector (421). In order for the display to be a reflective display there has to be a reflector there. Fig. 28 does not show a reflector but it is there. The reflector (421) from Fig. 22 is in between layer (511) and (557) of Fig. 28. Therefore, the reflector comprises programmable code information .The reflector and the register mark would be adjacent to each other which can be construed as the reflector comprising a programmable code. Applicant does not claim that the reflective layer is directly contacting the protrusion and that the light shielding layer is directly contacting the reflecting layer.

Regarding Claim 14

Matsuda et al discloses (Fig. 22 to Fig. 30) wherein the light reflective layer (421 and column 41, rows 39-41 where (552,553,554,555 are base material of light diffusing and reflecting type, therefore is considered a reflective layer) is disposed between the protrusion (412,512) and the light shielding layer (404, column 29,rows 9,10), such that the programmable code information (531) is located between the protrusions (412) and the light shielding layer (404) (column 36 rows 60-65).

Regarding Claim 18

Matsuda et al discloses (Fig. 22 to Fig. 30) wherein the substrate and the protrusion (lens) comprise different transparent material.

Regarding Claim 19

Matsuda et al discloses (Fig. 22 to Fig. 30) wherein the light reflective layer comprises aluminum (column 5, rows 42-56).

Claim 20-25,27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda et al (US 5361163) in view of Moon (US 6661485).

Regarding Claim 20.

Matsuda et al discloses everything as disclosed above.

Matsuda et al does not disclose a plurality of color filters, wherein the plurality of color filters are disposed between the light shielding layer and between the light reflective layer.

Moon discloses (fig. 5) the plurality of color filter (132) is disposed between the light shielding layer (black matrix) (134) and a light reflective layer (it is known in the art that the pixel electrode can be reflective 138).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Matsuda et al to include a color filter taught by Moon to provide a display that display's color light.

Regarding Claim 21.

In addition to Matsuda et al and Moon as disclosed above, Matsuda et al discloses wherein the programmable code information (register mark) is a position sensing code.

Regarding Claim 22.

In addition to Matsuda et al and Moon as disclosed above, Matsuda et al discloses the plurality of protrusions (412,512) are arcuate protrusions.

Regarding Claim 23.

In addition to Matsuda et al and Moon as disclosed above, Matsuda et al discloses wherein the light reflective layer (421 and Column 41, rows 49-53) is located between the plurality of protrusions (412) and the light shielding layer (404), and thereby the programmable code information (register mark, 531) is located between the plurality of protrusions (412) and the light shielding layer (404).

Regarding Claim 24,25.

In addition to Matsuda et al and Moon as disclosed above, Matsuda et al discloses wherein the plurality of protrusions (412,512) are formed on part or throughout the surface of the substrate.

Regarding Claim 27,

In addition to Matsuda et al and Moon as disclosed above, Matsuda et al discloses the substrate and protrusion (lens) comprise different transparent materials.

Regarding Claim 28,

In addition to Matsuda et al and Moon as disclosed above, Matsuda et al discloses the reflective layer is made of aluminum (column 5, rows 42-56).

Regarding Claim 29,30

In addition to Matsuda et al and Moon as disclosed above, Matsuda et al discloses a plurality of light reflective layers (the next pixel over will have a another light reflective layer) disposed on a surface of the protrusion (412,512), a plurality of light shielding layers (404, the next pixel over will have another light shielding layer, thus there is a plurality of light shielding layers), wherein each light shielding layer is disposed on a surface of the reflective layer (421) opposite to at least one protrusion (412,512). Moon discloses a plurality of color filters (under regarding claim 20).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUCY P. CHIEN whose telephone number is (571)272-8579. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (571)272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2871

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Lucy P Chien
Examiner
Art Unit 2871

/David Nelms/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2871